



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.          | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/679,842  | 10/06/2003  | Keith Bryan Knight   | LOT9-2003-0022-US1<br>(7321- | 3729             |
| 46321 7590 01/04/2007<br>CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP<br>STEVEN M. GREENBERG<br>950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE<br>SUITE 3020<br>BOCA RATON, FL 33487 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>HAMZA, FARUK     |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2155             | PAPER NUMBER     |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE  |             |                      | MAIL DATE                    | DELIVERY MODE    |
| 3 MONTHS  |             |                      | 01/04/2007                   | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

|                              |                                      |                                      |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/679,842 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>KNIGHT ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Faruk Hamza       | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2155              |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6,7,9-11 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4,5,8,12,14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/6/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on October 6, 2003.

Claims 1-15 are pending.

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims recite "a reverse proxy has obscured from view a server source of....." It is unclear and indefinite to examiner what applicant meant by obscured from view a server source. It is also unclear how server source is obscured while server address is known to the system.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,3,6,7,9,10,11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ponte (U.S. Patent Number 6,718,363) hereinafter Ponte and further in view of Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,442,144) hereinafter referred as Hansen.

Ponte teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method and device and computer storage medium for determining whether two pages linked on the world wide web are a part of the same world wide web site (See abstract).

As to claim 1, Ponte teaches a method for managing an interposed reverse proxy comprising the steps of:

comparing within a markup language document, a host address for said markup language document and a codebase address for a code base supporting logic disposed within said markup language document (Column 8, lines 62-Column 9, lines 62); and,

Ponte does not explicitly teach claim limitation a reverse proxy has obscured from view a server source of said markup language document.

Hansen teaches discovering and identifying network devices on network (See abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ponte by adding functionality of discovering and identifying network devices on network. One would be motivated to do so to enhance system's performance.

As to claim 3, Ponte teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said comparing step comprises the steps of: retrieving said markup language document for rendering within a content browser; parsing said markup language document to identify logic embedded within said markup language document; locating within said logic, a tag denoting a host address for said markup language document as viewed by a server which generated said markup language document; further locating within said logic, another tag denoting an address for a code base for said logic; and, comparing said addresses to determine if said host address differs from said address for said code base (Ponte, Column 8, lines 62-Column 9, lines 62).

System claim 6 and its dependent claims 7,9,10 and product claim 11 and its dependent claims 13 do not define or teach any new limitation other than above claims. Therefore rejected for similar reasons.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 2,4,5,8,12,14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faruk Hamza whose telephone number is 571-272-7969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

Art Unit: 2155

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll -free).

Faruk Hamza

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unite 2155

*Philip Tran*

PRIMARY EXAMINER